

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 18, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 27 and 33 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,147,667 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter "Yamazaki") in view of "Single-Crystal Si-Films via a Low Substrate Temperature Excimer-Laser Crystallization Method" by Sposili et al. (hereinafter "Sposili").

The rejection of claims 27 and 34 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Sposili is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 27 is allowable over Yamazaki in view of Sposili in that the structure of claim 27 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a pixel array including a switching device and a pixel electrode in the first region of the first substrate, the pixel array having an active layer formed of amorphous silicon", "a driver circuit formed on the first substrate in the second region, the driver circuit having an active layer formed of polycrystalline silicon crystallized from an amorphous silicon deposited directly on the first substrate, the polycrystalline having silicon grains growing by single-pulse lateral growth process", and "a controller unit formed on the first substrate in the third region, wherein the pixel array, driver circuit and controller unit are integrally located on the first substrate, and wherein the controller unit includes an active layer formed of single crystalline silicon in which silicon grains have a length beyond a single-pulse lateral growth distance and is grown from the amorphous silicon by single-pulse lateral growth process;" None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

The cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above-noted feature of the claimed invention. As pointed out in MPEP §2143.03, "all claim limitations must be taught or

suggested.” Thus, “to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974).”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 and claim 34, which depends from claim 27, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant